

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 5, 6, 11 and 13 are amended to merely clarify the recited subject matter. Claims 1 and 4-14 are pending.

Applicants submit that the amended claims fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claims 1, 4 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Andresen (U.S. 6,073,020), claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andresen and Haartsen (U.S. 6,021,124), and claims 8-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andresen in view of Dent (U.S. Patent No. 6,868,270). Applicants traverse the rejection because the cited prior art references, analyzed individually or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest all of the claimed features.

For example, the cited prior art fails to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed method of setting a timer associated with a protocol supporting a data link in a digital mobile communication system in a connection section, wherein the need to change the timer value is determined repeatedly during a connection, at a start of the connection or in response to a handover, as recited in independent claim 1, 8 and 11 and their respective dependent claims. Similarly, the cited prior art fails to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed method of setting a timer associated with a protocol supporting a data link in a digital mobile communication system in a connection section comprising a transmitting party and a receiving party, in which method an initial value has been defined for the timer, the method comprising setting the timer value to a value deviating from the initial value, should such a need be detected, and wherein the need to change the timer value being detected on the basis of the location of the mobile station, as recited in independent claim 10. Further, the cited prior art fails to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed equipment for setting a timer associated with a protocol supporting a data link in a digital mobile communication system in a connection section, the equipment being adapted to set the current timer value to a value deviating from the initial value, should such a need be detected and the equipment further comprising or having associated with it a data base comprising a plurality of different cell, location area and/or base station controller-specific timer values.

The Office Action has asserted that Andersen's "system time" corresponds to Applicants' claimed "timer." However, a timer value is very different from a system time. As is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art, a timer indicates relative times, such as a

time elapsed since the transmission of a packet from a network element. To the contrary, the system time merely indicates an absolute time.

In fact, Andersen's disclosure fails to teach or suggest any calculation of a relative time at all and does not contain the word "timer;" this should no be surprising however because Andersen's disclosure fails to relate to timers in any way. Accordingly, Andersen fails to teach or suggest any technology relating to a timer.

Furthermore, Applicants note that the Office Action's interpretation of Andersen is, in actuality, directly contrary to the claimed invention. Specifically, at page 3 of the Office Action, second paragraph, the Office Action has asserted that "the need to change the system time is repeated until the Time to Handoff is reached at step 206". That is, the need to change the system time is repeated until, i.e., before, the event (Time to Handoff). However, independent claims 1 and 11 each include the recitation wherein the need to change the timer value is determined repeatedly during a connection, in response to a handover. As a result, those claims require that the need to change the timer value is determined repeatedly during a connection, after a handover. Because the act or determining the timer value is performed in response to a handover, it must be performed after the handover. Thus, the Office Action's interpretation of Andersen's disclosure is radically different.

Miller, Haartsen and Dent fail to remedy these deficiencies as each of those references relates to particulars of mobile phone technology unrelated to the subject matter recited in the independent claims. Accordingly, the combined teachings of the cited prior art fail to disclose, teach or suggest all the features recited in the rejected claims. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 4-14 are allowable.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, Applicants look forward to receiving a Notice to that effect. However, if anything remains outstanding in order to place the application in condition for allowance, Applicant requests that the Examiner telephone the undersigned representative.

TIIHONEN ET AL. -- 09/762,721
Client/Matter: 060258-0277182

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP



CHRISTINE H. MCCARTHY

Reg. No. 41844

Tel. No. 703.770.7743

Fax No. 703.770.7901

Date: November 28, 2005
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-7900